

### **REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 2-4; cancel claims 1 and 5 and adds new claim 6. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 2-4 and 6.

Applicants note that the Examiner did not consider the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on December 27, 2000 along with the filing of the present application. A copy of said December 27, 2000 Information Disclosure Statement is attached herewith. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate that said Information Disclosure Statement has been considered.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Particularly, the Examiner alleges that the specification does not clearly differentiate what is meant by "input parameters" and "design results" or parameters. It should be noted that claims 1 and 5 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 1 and 5 is rendered moot. This rejection with respect to the remaining claims is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention particularly with regard to input parameters and design results are clearly described in the specification so as to reasonably convey to one skill in the relevant art that the inventors at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

As now more clearly recited in the claims the input parameters are input values that are values to be input so as to permit a simulation to be conducted. Whereas, design values as now more clearly recited in the claims are, for example, a

product obtained from a simulation which is performed using the input parameters. The Examiner's attention is directed to Fig. 2 of the present application and the corresponding description in the specification. Thus, a design value is calculated in order to determine whether the calculated value is appropriate for product design and such design value is calculated using input parameters according to the present invention.

Therefore, claims 2-4 and the specification fully complies with the written description requirement being that they reasonably convey to one skill in the relevant art that the inventors at the time the application was filed had possession of the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §112, first paragraph rejection of claims 2-4 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as the invention. As indicated above, claims 1 and 5 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 1 and 5 is rendered moot. Amendments were made to the remaining claims 2-4 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Umeda (U.S. Patent No. 5,544,348). As indicated above, claims 1 and 5 were canceled. Therefore, this rejection with respect to claims 1 and 5 is rendered moot. It should be noted that claims 2-4 originally depended from claim 1 but now depends from new claim 6. Therefore, this rejection with respect to the remaining claims 2-4

is also rendered moot since claims 2-4 now include new subject matter as set forth in new claim 6. Since this rejection is rendered moot with respect to the remaining claims, reconsideration and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

The present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 2-4 and 6 are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 2-4 and 6 are not taught or suggested by Umeda.

Umeda teaches a simulation method and apparatus that is modeled by object frames which describe information on the events to be processed by the system and a route frame that contains information on the conditions and times of the simulation. Umeda teaches performing a first step to search for an object which causes an event at the time prescribe by the route frame, a second step to list the events which simultaneously to search for the object and a third step where the first and second steps are repeatedly executed until completion of the simulation time.

The above described teachings of Umeda are entirely different from that of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. The present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims provides and input parameter setup supporting method in a simulation frame work including a processing unit prepared to repeatedly execute a simulation to derive, at each execution time, from a value set of input parameters, a design value of at least one item which indicates adequacy of the value set of input parameters. According to the present invention, as described, for example, on page 17, lines 7-23 of the present application both input parameters and simulation results are accumulated during a plurality of

performed simulations. In the present invention an appropriate set of parameter values for a design are determined in accordance with the pass simulation performed and accumulative distribution of the input values are further determined. Thus, in the present invention, a determination result as obtained by the above described processings is displayed on a screen as reference values used for succeeding simulations.

Thus, Umeda fails to teach or suggest accumulating individual design values which are results of a plurality of past time executions of the simulation and individual value sets of input parameter used in the past time execution of the simulation as recited in the claims.

Further, Umeda fails to teach or suggest for each kind of input parameter, deriving each accumulative value distribution, each reflecting selected value sets of the input parameters corresponding only to design values which satisfy one or more design conditions, among design values obtained through the past time executions of the simulation as recited in the claims.

Still further, Umeda fails to teach or suggest extracting one or more reference values of each input parameter from each accumulative value distribution and displaying, for each kind of input parameter, the extracted reference values and the number of extracted reference values as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Umeda does not anticipate nor render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 2-4 and 6.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the reference utilized in the rejection of claims 1-5.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 2-4 and 6 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 2-4 and 6 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (500.39434X00).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR, P.C.



---

Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 684-1120